(64)

No. 02-241

FILED
FEB 18 2003
OFFICE OF THE CLERK

In The

Supreme Court of the United States

BARBARA GRUTTER,

Petitioner,

v.

LEE BOLLINGER, ET AL.,

Respondents.

On Writ Of Certiorari To The United States Court Of Appeals For The Sixth Circuit

BRIEF FOR THE ARIZONA STATE UNIVERSITY COLLEGE OF LAW SUPPORTING RESPONDENTS

PATRICIA D. WHITE
Dean
GEORGE SCHATZKI
Chairman, Committee on Admissions
College of Law
ARIZONA STATE UNIVERSITY
Of Counsel

RALPH S. SPRITZER
PAUL BENDER
Counsel of Record
College of Law
ARIZONA STATE UNIVERSITY
Box 877906
Tempe, AZ 85287-7906
(480) 965-2556
Attorneys for Amicus Curiae

COCKLE LAW BRIEF PRINTING CO. (800) 225-6964
OR CALL COLLECT (402) 342-2831

BEST AVAILABLE COPY

24 pp

QUESTION PRESENTED

Does a state university law school's use of race and ethnicity as positive factors in student admissions decisions violate the Equal Protection Clause of the Fourteenth Amendment?

TABLE OF CONTENTS

	Page
Question Presented	i
Interest of the Amicus	1
Summary of Argument	2
Argument	3
I. Amicus' Use Of Race And Ethnicity As Positive Factors In Its Admissions Decisions Enables It To Maintain A Diverse Student Body And Promotes Diversity In The Arizona Bar And The Arizona Judiciary	3
A. Arizona's Two State Law Schools Contribute Importantly To The Arizona Bar And Judiciary	3
B. Amicus' Use Of Race And Ethnicity As Positive Factors In Admissions Decisions Is Necessary In Order To Achieve A Significant Degree Of Diversity In Its Student Body	6
C. Diversity In The State's Law Schools Has Significant And Continuing Implications For Arizona's Bar And Judiciary	15
II. Racial And Ethnic Diversity In The Student Body Contributes Substantially To The Quality Of Amicus' Educational Program	17
Conclusion	21

TABLE OF AUTHORITIES

CASES

Regents of the University of California v. Bakke, 438 U.S. 265 (1978) 1

INTEREST OF THE AMICUS[1]

Like respondent University of Michigan Law School, the College of Law of Arizona State University takes account of a wide variety of factors, race and ethnicity included, in addition to undergraduate grades and LSAT scores, in passing upon applications for admission. We do so in the conviction, confirmed by our experience, which is similar to that of many other colleges and universities throughout the nation, that "the interest of diversity is compelling in the context of a university's admission program." *Regents of the University of California v. Bakke*, 438 U.S. 265, 314 (1978) (opinion of Justice Powell).

Currently, the student population of this law school is 550. One hundred sixty-three students, about 30% of that student body, are members of minority racial or ethnic groups: 74 are Hispanic, 42 American Indian, 25 Asian-American, 22 African-American. The interaction among and between the diverse elements of our student body has proved critical in the effectiveness of the educational experience at this school. As we point out below, if the factors of race and ethnicity could not be taken into account in the selection of qualified students, the College would have no assurance that there would be a significant number of any of the minority groups that are now well-represented. The importance of student body diversity is strikingly illustrated by the development in recent years of

[1] The written consent of the parties to the filing of amicus briefs in this case is on file with the Clerk. No counsel for any party was an author of this brief in whole or in part. No person or entity other than amicus has made a monetary contribution to this brief.

this College's nationally-noted Indian Legal Program, which currently draws students from twenty-five different American Indian nations and annually provides scholarship, research, professional resources and personnel to Indian tribes and communities in Arizona and across the country.

SUMMARY OF ARGUMENT

It is the admissions policy of the Arizona State University College of Law to consider, in addition to past academic performance as revealed by grades and test scores, a variety of factors, including race and ethnicity. This admissions policy is grounded on the premise that diversity is a value contributing significantly to public education. Specifically, we point out below that Arizona's two law schools constitute the principal academic resource of the Arizona Bar and its judiciary; that minority representation in the legal profession in this State depends heavily upon a minority presence in the State's law schools; that if amicus failed to take account of race and ethnicity, there would be no assurance that the minorities now well-represented in the student body would have a continued presence sufficient to constitute a critical mass; and that, in that eventuality, there would be a distinct and serious loss to the dimensions and the quality of amicus' education program and to the legal community.

ARGUMENT

I. AMICUS' USE OF RACE AND ETHNICITY AS POSITIVE FACTORS IN ITS ADMISSIONS DECISIONS ENABLES IT TO MAINTAIN A DIVERSE STUDENT BODY AND PROMOTES DIVERSITY IN THE ARIZONA BAR AND THE ARIZONA JUDICIARY.

A. Arizona's Two State Law Schools Contribute Importantly To The Arizona Bar And Judiciary.

The State of Arizona has two law schools. Both are state institutions. The older of the two schools, now the James E. Rogers College of Law, is part of the University of Arizona in Tucson and was established in 1915. Arizona State University College of Law, located at Arizona State University's main campus in Tempe, was established in 1967. There are no private law schools in Arizona.

Tuition rates at Arizona's two state law schools are low in comparison with tuition rates at other American law schools. Tuition for Arizona residents at the two state law schools is currently about $5,800 per year. By contrast, tuition for Arizona residents at public and private law schools in neighboring States is much higher. For example, non-resident tuition at the law school of the University of New Mexico in Albuquerque is $12,462. Non-resident tuition at the University of Nevada at Las Vegas Law School is $26,260. Non-resident tuition at state law schools in California is about four times that of Arizona resident tuition. Law school tuition for non-California residents is $22,835 at UCLA, $22,158 at the University of California at Berkeley, $22,128 at the University of California, Davis, and $21,623 at the University of California, Hastings. Tuition for Arizonans at the few private law

schools in neighboring states is higher still – $30,880 at Stanford University and $32,144 at the University of Southern California. Living expenses are also likely to be substantially higher for Arizona residents at out-of-state law schools than at schools in Tucson or in Tempe (which is part of the Phoenix metropolitan area).

For Arizona residents who wish to go to law school and who have limited financial resources, the inability to gain admission to one of the State's two law schools may, in practical effect, prevent them from attending *any* law school, thus precluding service in any public or private positions that require legal training. The same is true of Arizona law school applicants who have working spouses, or who have family or business obligations in Arizona that require them to stay in the Phoenix or Tucson areas.

The two Arizona law schools are of approximately the same size. Each enrolls a first-year class of between 150 and 200 students and graduates a slightly smaller number of J.D. candidates each year. A large portion of these graduates go on to practice law in Arizona. In each of the past three years for which complete information is available (1999, 2000 and 2001), between 85% and 90% of the members of amicus' graduating classes have entered law practice in Arizona.

Graduates of the two state law schools now constitute a substantial percentage of the members and leaders of the Arizona bar, the members of the Arizona judiciary, and the members of the federal judiciary in Arizona. At present, approximately 45% of the active members of the Arizona bar are graduates of one of the two schools. Twelve of the 19 current elected members of the State Bar's Board of Governors are graduates of one of the two

schools. The United States Attorney for the District of Arizona, the State Attorney General, and 11 of Arizona's 15 County Attorneys are graduates of one of the two schools. Just prior to the most recent retirement from the Arizona Supreme Court, four of the five members of that Court were graduates of one of the State's two law schools. Of the State's 22 Court of Appeals judges (the Court of Appeals is the State's intermediate appellate court), 14 (64%) are graduates of one of the State's two law schools. Of Arizona's 159 Superior Court (the trial court of record) judges, 96 (60%) are graduates of one of the two schools. Two of the four Arizona members of the United States Court of Appeals for the 9th Circuit are graduates of amicus and, of the 17 federal district court judges in Arizona, 13 are graduates of one of the State's two law schools. Ten of the 11 Arizona United States Magistrate Judges graduated from one of the schools. One of the State's two U.S. Senators and two of the State's three representatives in Congress who are lawyers graduated from one of the two schools. Of the 9 members of the current Arizona legislature who are lawyers, 6 are graduates of one of the State's two law schools.

As these figures show, racial and ethnic diversity within the Arizona bar and within the state and federal judiciaries in Arizona has depended – and, in the future, will very likely continue heavily to depend – upon the racial and ethnic diversity of the student bodies at the State's two public law schools. Arizona's population of about 5 million is diverse; more than one third of Arizonans are Hispanic, American Indian, African-American, or

Asian-American. This diversity is expected to continue to grow. Unless the bar and judiciary are to be composed almost entirely of Caucasians[2], however, a significant degree of diversity must exist in the student bodies at the State's two law schools.

B. Amicus' Use Of Race And Ethnicity As Positive Factors In Admissions Decisions Is Necessary In Order To Achieve A Significant Degree Of Diversity In Its Student Body.

1. Amicus has used both race and ethnicity as positive factors in its admissions decisions since this Court's decision in *Regents of the University of California v. Bakke*, 438 U.S. 265 (1978). In this respect, amicus' admissions process is similar to the process used by respondent University of Michigan Law School and challenged by petitioner.

For the past several years, amicus' admissions process has been as follows: Each applicant to the J.D. program is assigned an admissions index, based on the applicant's LSAT score and college grades. The applicant's entire file is read by an admissions officer, who summarizes its contents (the summary includes the admissions index, the undergraduate institution, the undergraduate field of study, and other relevant admissions factors) and forwards a recommendation regarding admission to a committee composed of four faculty members and four students, who

[2] For convenience, we use "Caucasian" throughout this brief to refer to non-Hispanic Caucasians.

are selected by the Dean. The committee meets, discusses the recommendations, and makes the final admissions decisions. The committee members may, and often do, consult the applicant's full admissions file, which includes a resume, employment and public service history, a personal statement, the college transcript, the applicant's LSAT score, information about graduate study, if any, and letters of recommendation.

Amicus' pedagogical mission is to produce effective members of the legal profession. Aware that LSAT scores and college grade point averages do not account for all of the elements that may play a role in the applicant's future performance, the committee considers a number of relevant factors in addition to the applicant's numerical admissions index. These factors include the quality of the applicant's undergraduate institution, graduate study (if any) prior to law school, the rigor of the applicant's field of concentration, distinctive non-academic talents, successes and achievements, any past history of public service, the applicant's employment history, extracurricular activities, volunteer work, publications, the quality of the applicant's personal statement, the applicant's writing ability, the applicant's relationship, if any, to amicus' alumni or alumnae, the contribution to the diversity of the class that the applicant would make in view of the applicant's residence, age, race, ethnicity, field of concentration and undergraduate institution, the applicant's economic disadvantage, if any, and the applicant's interest, if any, in either of amicus' two specialized programs – the Center for Law, Science and Technology, and the Indian Legal Program. Although race and ethnicity are used as positive admissions factors, applicants who would add to the racial or ethnic diversity of the student body are not by any

means automatically admitted. For example, there were approximately 2,400 applications to the last five entering classes from Hispanics, American Indians, African-Americans and Asian-Americans. Twenty-six percent of these applicants were offered admission; 74% were rejected.

Amicus' admissions process has, during the past several years, produced a student body that is significantly diverse in many respects, including age (the range during the last five years has been from 18 to 66), gender (recent classes have been about half men and half women), and undergraduate institution attended (78 institutions are represented in the current first year class). Our classes have also been racially and ethnically diverse. The following chart shows the racial and ethnic composition of amicus' entering classes during the past five years.

Class Enrolled in 1998

Total number of students enrolled	162
Caucasian students	124 (77%)
Hispanic students	19 (12%)
American Indian students	11 (7%)
African-American students	4 (2%)
Asian-American students	4 (2%)

Class Enrolled in 1999

Total	163
Caucasian	111 (68%)
Hispanic	22 (13%)
American Indian	11 (7%)
African-American	12 (7%)
Asian-American	7 (4%)

Class Enrolled in 2000

Total	199
Caucasian	140 (70%)
Hispanic	29 (15%)
American Indian	13 (7%)
African-American	7 (4%)
Asian-American	10 (5%)

Class Enrolled in 2001

Total	177
Caucasian	133 (75%)
Hispanic	18 (10%)
American Indian	9 (5%)
African-American	9 (5%)
Asian-American	8 (5%)

Class Enrolled in 2002

Total	172
Caucasian	111 (65%)
Hispanic	29 (17%)
American Indian	16 (9%)
African-American	6 (3%)
Asian-American	10 (6%)

As these figures indicate, amicus does not employ any racial or ethnic quotas or fixed goals regarding the composition of its student body; nor does amicus seek to mirror the percentages of various groups in Arizona's overall

population.[3] The aim is to admit a diverse class of highly qualified students.

In order to determine whether a significant degree of student-body diversity would have been achieved if amicus did *not* use race and ethnicity as admissions factors, amicus has undertaken a study of its admissions data for the past five years. Using prevailing "yield" rates (i.e., the percentage of admitted applicants who actually enroll), we have calculated what the racial and ethnic composition of our entering classes would have been in each of these years if the entering classes had contained the same number of students as in the actual entering classes, but if applicants had been accepted for admission solely on the basis of their grades and LSAT scores without considering race or ethnicity.[4] These calculations show the following:

[3] Hispanics currently comprise about 25% of Arizona's population, American Indians about 5%, African-Americans about 3% and Asian-Americans about 2%.

[4] Amicus has never relied exclusively on LSAT scores and GPA in making admissions decisions. Experience shows that small differences in these numerical indices are not predictive of success at our law school. Eliminating race and ethnicity as factors would not affect consideration of such other factors as age, geography, physical disability, etc. that play a role in the composition of the student body. It is nonetheless evident, as indicated *infra*, that consideration of these other factors will not lead to a racially and ethnically diverse class unless race and ethnicity are also used as admissions factors.

First-Year Classes That Would Have Been Enrolled Had Admissions Decisions Been Based Entirely On College Grades And LSAT Scores

1998	
Total number of students	162
Caucasian students	149 (92%)
Hispanic students	9 (6%)
American Indian students	2 (1%)
African-American students	2 (1%)
1999	
Total	163
Caucasian	152 (93%)
Hispanic	5 (3%)
American Indian	0 (0%)
African-American	0 (0%)
Asian-American	6 (4%)
2000	
Total	199
Caucasian	191 (96%)
Hispanic	4 (2%)
American Indian	1 (1%)
African-American	0 (0%)
Asian-American	3 (2%)
2001	
Total	177
Caucasian	169 (95%)
Hispanic	3 (2%)
American Indian	2 (1%)
African-American	0 (0%)
Asian-American	3 (2%)

2002	
Total	172
Caucasian	163 (95%)
Hispanic	6 (3%)
American Indian	0 (0%)
African-American	1 (1%)
Asian-American	2 (1%)

As these figures show, exclusive use during the past five years of LSAT scores and undergraduate grades, rather than the use of the multi-factored system, including race and ethnicity, that amicus actually used, would have had a dramatic and negative impact on the racial and ethnic diversity of amicus' student body. The percentage of Caucasians in the entering classes would have been between 92% and 96%, rather than between 65% and 77%. The percentage of Hispanic students would have been between 2% and 6% rather than between 10% and 17%. The percentage of American Indians would have been 1% or zero, rather than 5% to 9%. The number of African-Americans in the class would have been zero in four of the five years, and there would have been one African-American student in the other year. The percentage of Asian-American students would have declined from a range of 2% to 6% to a range of 1% to 4%. The difference between the diversity of amicus' actual entering classes in the past five years and the classes that would have entered had admissions decisions been based entirely on grades and test scores is shown in a chart reproduced in the Appendix, *infra*.[5]

[5] The meager figures for minorities would likely have been even smaller than the figures shown in the chart if GPA and LSAT numbers

(Continued on following page)

2. The figures in the preceding subsection of this brief show how basing admissions decisions solely on LSAT scores and undergraduate grades would almost certainly result in a student body with, at most, token racial and ethnic diversity. It has been suggested that significant racial and ethnic diversity can result from the use of admissions factors other than race and ethnicity. None of the three most prominent such proposals, however, is likely to yield such a result for amicus or similarly situated law schools.

a. In a few States, the public high school graduates who finish at the top of their high school classes are guaranteed places in undergraduate programs at State universities. Amicus understands that this system is used in Texas, California and Florida.

These programs are calculated to produce student-body diversity in undergraduate institutions if a substantial number of the public high schools in the State are *de facto* segregated institutions. This is true since the top high school graduates at a virtually all-African-American, all-Hispanic or all-American-Indian high school are likely to be almost all African-American, Hispanic or American Indian. Unlike the public high school situation prevailing in many places in the United States, however, there is no universe of segregated undergraduate institutions that could play a comparable role vis-a-vis professional schools. There are a few four-year undergraduate schools in the United States that have predominantly African-American

served as the sole criteria for admission. Our experience demonstrates that some members of a minority group are discouraged from entering a law school that lacks a critical mass of their cohorts.

or Hispanic student bodies, but the number of graduates of these schools each year who are interested in going to law school has been infinitesimally small in comparison to the overall number of law school applicants. Graduates of those schools, moreover, almost never apply for admission to amicus' program and none of those schools is located in Arizona.

b. It is sometimes suggested that, if poverty were used as an admissions factor, substantial ethnic and racial diversity would be achieved in higher educational institutions. In amicus' experience, however, using poverty as a positive admissions factor is unlikely to result in a significantly greater degree of student-body racial and ethnic diversity than the use of numerical admissions indices alone because (i) the vast majority of poor people in the United States are Caucasian, not Hispanic, American Indian, African-American or Asian-American, (ii) very few people from the lowest ranks of the economic spectrum seek admission to law school or could afford to do so in light of their need to earn a living for themselves and their families, and (iii) to the extent that poor people apply to amicus, we already take that factor into account in the evaluation of applications. Experience indicates that the use of poverty, without the accompanying use of race and ethnicity, will not measurably increase racial or ethnic minority presence in amicus' student body.

c. "Disadvantage" also does not appear to be an admissions factor the use of which will result in racial and ethnic diversity in amicus' student body. As just noted, using the fact that an applicant has overcome the disadvantage of poverty as a positive admissions factor, as amicus does, accomplishes little in achieving racial and ethnic diversity, unless admissions decisions also take race

and ethnicity into account. If the factor of "disadvantage" is used to refer to disadvantages other than those caused by poverty or membership in a minority racial or ethnic group, the factor becomes so broad and formless as to be largely meaningless. Our applicants call our attention to a great variety of disadvantages they have suffered, including the trauma resulting from the death or illness of family members or friends, overbearing, unsympathetic or non-supportive parents, failing businesses, frequent family moves, instability of the family unit, personal illness or injury, emotional problems, and many other difficulties. Virtually all applicants can honestly claim to have overcome some sort of disadvantage or adversity. Consideration of this broad range of "disadvantages," without consideration of race and ethnicity, will not significantly contribute to amicus' student-body diversity.

C. Diversity In The State's Law Schools Has Significant And Continuing Implications For Arizona's Bar And Judiciary.

There is currently relatively little racial and ethnic diversity in the Arizona Bar and Judiciary. The degree of diversity that does exist is in large measure attributable to increases, during the last 25 years, in the diversity of the student bodies at the two State law schools. Unless those schools continue to admit diverse student bodies, the future participation of minorities in the Arizona bar and judiciary will be greatly inhibited.

Arizona's bar currently has about 12,500 active members. Of the bar members who have chosen to identify their race or ethnicity, approximately 6% identify themselves as Hispanic, 1% as American Indian, 2% as African-American, and 2% as Asian-American. Graduates of

amicus and of the University of Arizona's Law School comprise approximately 55% of those who identify themselves as minority group members. A large portion of the minority members of the Arizona bar are relatively young. If the State's two law schools had not had diverse student bodies in recent years, the currently limited diversity of the Arizona bar would be more limited still. If Arizona's two law schools do not continue to admit racially and ethnically diverse student bodies, the Arizona bar will almost certainly remain an overwhelmingly white institution in a State in which minorities constitute 35% of the population, a percentage that continues to grow.

There is a like connection between the diversity of the student bodies at the two State law schools and the diversity of Arizona's judiciary. Twenty-nine members of the Arizona Court of Appeals and the Arizona Superior Court are members of minority racial or ethnic groups. Of these, 23 (79%) are graduates of one of the State's two law schools. It is thus predictable that, if Arizona's law schools should prove unable to graduate significant numbers of qualified minority lawyers in the future, the prospect of achieving a significant measure of racial and ethnic diversity in the judiciary will founder. A lack of diversity will also characterize other important public and private leadership positions in Arizona that require legal training – prosecutors, public defenders, heads of government agencies, bar leaders, members of important bar committees, general counsels of Arizona companies, and the like.

II. RACIAL AND ETHNIC DIVERSITY IN THE STUDENT BODY CONTRIBUTES SUBSTANTIALLY TO THE QUALITY OF AMICUS' EDUCATIONAL PROGRAM.

Other briefs filed in this case describe the value of a racially and ethnically diverse student body to a law school seeking to explore current legal issues and to prepare students to practice in an increasingly diverse society. These considerations are especially strong in Arizona.

Hispanic culture and life, for example, are an extremely important part of modern Arizona society, where Hispanics constitute about 25% of the population, a percentage that has been growing steadily. It would be almost unthinkable for a public law school in Arizona today to educate Arizona lawyers in an institution with only token Hispanic presence.

A significant population of Hispanic students also helps to attract Hispanic faculty and other faculty interested in doing research, teaching and publishing with regard to legal issues that are of special concern to the growing Hispanic population of the Southwest. That diverse population also permits amicus to enroll Hispanic students who are able to serve as interns and externs for the State Legislature and for Arizona members of Congress or as law clerks for state and federal judges, to work in clinical programs that serve the Hispanic community, and to serve as interns and externs for federal, state and local prosecutors and public defenders. Many of the same factors apply to the educational benefits gained by the presence of more than a token number of African-American and Asian-American students in our student body.

One quarter of the land in Arizona consists of American Indian reservations. Arizona is home to the nation's largest Indian reservation – that of the Navajo Nation – and has more Indians living on its 22 Indian reservations than live on reservations in any other State. Each of Arizona's reservations has a tribal governmental structure, usually including a tribal court system and a tribal legislative body. As the Court is well aware, the legal issues raised by the interaction of federal, state and tribal governmental systems in States like Arizona are both important and complex. Those issues require close and continuous academic and scholarly attention.

The presence of a substantial number of American Indian students in amicus' student body has permitted amicus to develop the Arizona State University Indian Legal Program (ILP), one of the country's outstanding Indian law programs. The ILP directs scholarly and instructional attention to important Indian legal issues. The ILP currently has 50 participating students, including 39 Indian students from 25 different Indian nations. A former faculty member, Senior Judge William Canby of the Court of Appeals for the Ninth Circuit, who is one of the nation's pre-eminent Indian law scholars, serves on the ILP Advisory Committee. Amicus currently has one tenured American Indian faculty member – a nationally- and internationally-recognized scholar who also serves as Executive Director of the Indian Legal Program. The Director of the Program is an American Indian attorney. A nationally-known American Indian lawyer who recently served as Assistant Secretary of the Interior for Indian Affairs will join the faculty in July, 2003, as a full-time faculty member. The country's leading academic authority on tribal jurisdiction is also a tenured professor in the ILP.

The first President of the Navajo Nation serves as a half-time advisor to the Program. Leading Indian lawyers and authorities – including a member of the Navajo Supreme Court – frequently serve as adjunct or visiting faculty members. Several of amicus' faculty members serve as judges on tribal appellate courts, including the courts of 6 different Indian nations located in 4 different States.[6]

Both Indian and non-Indian students participating in the ILP earn intern and externship credit as law clerks to tribal courts or assistants to tribal prosecutors or defenders. Amicus conducts training programs for tribal judges as well as numerous seminars, conferences and public programs each year on important Indian law issues. Amicus' curriculum offers eight courses in Indian law. The ILP offers a Certificate in Indian Law to students who satisfy the requirements of the program, which include course work, a substantial paper, and practical experience with Indian legal work. Our students and faculty participate in helping tribal governments draft revised tribal constitutions, legal codes and procedural rules.

After graduation, many of amicus' American Indian students work for tribal governments or serve as tribal judges or prosecutors in Arizona and elsewhere. Four of

---

[6] The ILP has attracted substantial federal and tribal governmental financial support for its programs. Amicus has entered into agreements with the federal Bureau of Reclamation and the Navajo Nation that provide funding for scholarships for American Indian law students. The ILP has also entered into cooperative agreements with the Arizona Tribal Judges Association and Motorola Corporation that have facilitated the training of tribal judges and the development of tribal court information-technology infrastructures.

amicus' graduates have served as attorneys-general for the Navajo Nation and many others have worked for the Nation's Justice Department. Two recent ILP students have secured positions as clerks for Judges of the Court of Appeals for the Ninth Circuit. One recent ILP graduate currently serves as the legal counsel and advisor to the Assistant Secretary for Indian Affairs in the U.S. Interior Department. One ILP graduate is president of one of the tribal community colleges. ILP graduates also include partners and associates in prominent national law firms practicing in the field of Indian law. One of amicus' graduates is Presiding Judge of a division of the State Superior Court – the first American Indian judge of a state court of record in Arizona.[7]

Few of these activities would have occurred if amicus had not taken race and ethnicity into account in its admissions decisions. Amicus would not, for example, have been able to attract faculty specializing in federal Indian law and tribal law without a substantial number of American Indian students in the student body. Tribes would not turn to amicus as a center of intellectual Indian law activity and as a source of advice and cooperative help without that body of students. The entire faculty is substantively affected by the presence of our Indian law program,

[7] Hispanic and African American graduates of amicus have also served important leadership roles. A member of Arizona's delegation in the U.S. Congress is a Hispanic graduate. Another Hispanic graduate was recently U.S. Attorney for the District of Arizona. An African-American graduate has recently served as Lieutenant Governor of a neighboring western State.

leading to the incorporation of Indian-law related issues into the syllabi of many traditional courses.

CONCLUSION

Racial and ethnic diversity have critical significance for the quality of the intellectual life and education in our school and for the vitality of the legal community in Arizona. That diversity depends on the use of race and ethnicity as admissions factors.

The judgment of the Court of Appeals should be affirmed.

Respectfully submitted.

PATRICIA D. WHITE
Dean
GEORGE SCHATZKI
Chairman, Committee on Admissions
College of Law
ARIZONA STATE UNIVERSITY
Of Counsel

RALPH S. SPRITZER
PAUL BENDER
Counsel of Record
College of Law
ARIZONA STATE UNIVERSITY
Box 877906
Tempe, AZ 85287-7906
(480) 965-2556
Attorneys for Amicus Curiae

February, 2003.

APPENDIX

Difference Between Diversity In Actual Entering Classes And Diversity If Admissions Decisions Had Been Based Solely On LSAT And GPA

	Caucasian Students	Hispanic Students	American Indian Students	African-American Students	Asian-American Students
Class Enrolled in 1998					
Percentage in Actual Entering Class	77%	12%	7%	2%	2%
Percentage in Class That Would Have Been Admitted Based Solely on LSAT and GPA	92%	6%	1%	0%	1%
Class Enrolled in 1999					
Actual Class	68%	13%	7%	7%	4%
Class based on LSAT and GPA	93%	3%	0%	0%	4%
Class Enrolled in 2000					
Actual Class	70%	15%	7%	4%	5%
Class based on LSAT and GPA	96%	2%	1%	0%	2%
Class Enrolled in 2001					
Actual Class	75%	10%	5%	5%	5%
Class based on LSAT and GPA	95%	2%	1%	0%	2%
Class Enrolled in 2002					
Actual Class	65%	17%	9%	3%	6%
Class based on LSAT and GPA	95%	3%	0%	1%	1%